

Office of the Director
111 N. Front St., 8th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-9040
(614) 645-7795
(614) 645-6675 (FAX)

Planning Division
111 N. Front St., 3rd Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-9040
(614) 645-8664

Downtown Commission
Daniel J. Thomas (Staff)
Urban Design Manager
(614) 645-8404
djthomas@columbus.gov

DOWNTOWN COMMISSION RESULTS

Tuesday, December 18, 2018 - 8:30 AM

**111 N. Front Street, Michael B. Coleman Government Center
Hearing Room (Second Floor)**

I. Attendance

Present: Steve Wittmann (Chair); Otto Beatty, Jr.; Robert Loversidge; Mike Lusk;
Jana Maniace

Absent: Tedd Hardesty; Kyle Katz; Danni Palmore

City Staff: Daniel Thomas, Brandan Hayes

II. Approval of the November 20, 2018 Downtown Commission Meeting Results

Motion to approve (ML, JM) 5-0

8:40

III. Recommendation to Public Service

Case #1 18-12-1

9:30

Location: Throughout Downtown, (Initially 35 sites)

Extends into Short North, German Village and Brewery District

Applicant: Greater Columbus Convention & Visitors Bureau (Experience Columbus)

Property Owner: City of Columbus Right of Way (Public Service)

*The **ike** program has already been presented to the Brewery District, German Village, Italian Village and Victorian Village Historic Review Commissions.*

Request:

Advisory recommendation to Public Service for the placement of interactive information kiosks on downtown sidewalks.

Discussion: EC – tourism and visitors into Columbus is important to economy and jobs. Enhancing visitor experience. Interactive kiosks. Met with Special Improvement Districts for their input and support. Platform to guide discovery of local events, restaurants, services, etc. Mark Thompson - Show of short video introducing ike. Program launched in Denver. ADA compliant and flexible. Public safety features. Transit. Information can be transferred to mobile devices. Wayfinding Customized content management system.

Virtually no cost to the City or to Experience Columbus. Changes made in real time. Wish to serve all levels of city clientele. JM – what about use by people who are not familiar with smart phone applications? How to make more accessible and navigable? Pete Scantland – one touch accessibility. Includes job board. JM – will there be benches in the vicinity? A. – some concerns in other cities with too much lingering at stations. In addition to social equity there are some fun features such as photo booth.

Showing of ike hardware – 8.5 ft tall, 3 ft wide and 1.5 ft deep. Emergency call button on side – only verbal two-way communication. Transit pylon, which is not interactive, slightly larger. RL – where are those going to be? SW – why do you need two different ones? A – the interactive kiosks is more expensive and designed for the core urban areas. RL – why does the transit pylon need to be larger? SW – are the two different pillars / kiosks differentiated on the plan? A – our initial plan is to install kiosks in the primary core area. Of 35 locations, probably 28 will be ike kiosks. SW – would you come back to us for a recommendation if you wanted to expand the number of locations? The transit pillar would be static and be a combination of transit information (map) and advertising. On the pillar, there would be a small touch screen on the side, as well as a transit map on the other side. RL – this is all just a billboard? A – No. It's more than that. At least about 20% of the time the information on the pillars will be public service in orientation. Pillars would likely change every month. The two larger sides of the pillars have two displays.

A – we are looking for a recommendation to move forward with the project. The locations downtown will most likely be all ike with the possibility of some transit pillars added later, most likely on the periphery.

SW – possibility of too much clutter. Would you put these wherever you want to or would you come back once specific locations are known? A – we will be working with City to specify exact locations. Not our intention to come back for approvals of locations. SW – what about brightness? A – each ike will have sensor adjusted to standard ambient light. Looking for commercial pedestrian foot traffic areas. SW – too many and too bright would be obtrusive. A – we have a great incentive to make certain ikes are not too bright. The same sort of system has been tested in Denver. The ikes can have their brightness set remotely too. SW – concern that image is seen close up and low to the ground. A – these are essentially TV screens, not big LED screens, overall intensity is lower. OB – are the screens timed out – can people monopolize a screen? A – We don't control, but average use is 20 to 30 seconds. RL – who programs and updates? A – there is a centralized content management system operated in coordination with Experience Columbus and SIDs. Some things are automatically updated which is also monitored. We are also tied into COTA, bike share and other ride share services. RL – advertising is mentioned but hasn't been shown – how does that work. There is a split screen, the top third will be advertising. When no one is there, the whole screen will be occupied with in a loop with Experience Columbus, City of Columbus, SID and advertising.

ML – transit monolith seems high, ADA issues? A – we are still working on the engineering and design. ML – voice recognition? A – there will be visual impaired such as a high contrast mode. We're working on it. OB – likes making negotiating downtown better, particularly with the interface with cell phone.

Sides operate independently. RL – I think ike is a good idea, it could provide a public service to downtown, I think we should recommend to Public Services that it should be approved. I don't like the idea of a blank check in terms of where these things go – I think the Downtown Commission should be involved with siting them. I think our recommendation should that the locations be followed that are on the map (red dots) and limited to ikes. If you decide you want to use the other ones come back. A – we are in the process of checking for utilities and clearances – consider the entirety of locations. SW – that seems like a lot, I'd rather see what they look like first. I'm concerned that these might be too much. A – we agree, it wouldn't be to our advantage to have too much. Trying to balance placemaking and economics (50:29) ML – how about all of the locations in red and blue are acceptable, but come back and show us the final locations? EC – one thing that our visitors say is that they find it difficult to find out about what is happening at the moment – this provides that opportunity, which helps in economic impact of visit. A – Also every place on the interactive video is not being charged. Helps local businesses get discovered.

RL - I'm still concerned about location. I wouldn't want to see one on the capitol grounds, on that side of the sidewalk. A - we have been working closely with the various SIDs. To answer JM's question the system is designed to be invitational, to get people to be involved from the onset. RL – the Downtown Commission's interests are a little bit different from the SIDs, we're looking at the entire city and I think there are locations that should be off limits, such as Supreme Court, State House side or City Hall. Maybe across the street. Ike is a commercial enterprise. Our job is to determine where and how many. I don't know if all of these locations would be too many. We should have some form of authority or recommendation of where they go. RL - *I propose that we recommend to Public Service that this program proceed in the downtown as described with ike installed only at this time and that you come back when you decide you want to add the transit monoliths and that you put them at or near the locations shown in the map, including red and blue locations (but no more than that) and that if they change substantively that they should come back and give us an update.* ML – 2nd.

Results: Recommendation to Public Service to support (see italics above). 5-0 59:00

IV. Requests for Certificate of Appropriateness

Case #2 18-12-2

59:20

Location: Block Bound by Library Park Dr. (N), Grant, Oak and Ninth

Applicant: Jon Riewald, The Pizzuti Companies

Property Owner: Columbus Metropolitan Library Board of Trustees

Design Professionals: Lupton Rausch Architects / David Goth (New Construction)
Sullivan and Bruck Architects, Phil Herrin (Renovation)
MKSK, Site and Landscaping

Request:

Certificate of Appropriateness for apartments, includes new, renovation and selected demolition

This project was Conceptually Reviewed by the Commission in August, 2018 – please refer to the attached Results from that meeting..

Discussion: Additional detailed information has been provided. JR – same program that was presented in August – a combination a renovated and new apartments - 80 new and 70 renovated (affordable) from 4 kept buildings. One of the chief tasks was to have an integrated and unified project relating to the library and Topiary Park. Introduction of design team.

RL – one of the goals from August was to create an entrance to the garage to the library. JR – at library's request it reverted back to original condition – no changes to traffic. Staff – distribution of letter of recommendation from the Columbus Metropolitan Library.

DG – walk through of project. Podium style building. Trying to address massing, colors and materials of adjacent buildings, including library. White and grey stone and concrete. Plain façade along library. Dark finished windows. Aluminum at grade and probably vinyl clad above. Juliet style balconies on the top. Upper level amenity space on the eastern top floor. Relating to Topiary Park. JM – issue about blank wall at SE corner, it's a prominent corner - possibilities.

DG – art wall on south elevation – to disguise parking, discussed. Graphics are representational, at this point in time. Courtyard between the buildings. On Oak St. on western side of site, mature

trees will remain. To the east, where the new building will be, Oak St. will adhere to Downtown Streetscape Standards, a continuation of the pattern used for Motorists. On Library Park Dr. the sidewalk treatment will essentially remain the same as is. With the remaining older buildings there will be an attempt to balance them with the library and new buildings. Upgrading with paint (shades of gray). SW – I don't like the wood around the doors. I don't think it will last. RL – concern over lack of detail. JM – would cedar gray over time? SW – why red cedar? JS – giving residential appearance, a little more contemporary. Example from another building in Columbus. RL – replacing the Colonialish surrounds is a good idea, but I'm still skeptical. I think painting is a great way to tie it all together. Originally in August I advocated for use of brick in new building to tie it all together – I think this does the same thing. Blends in nicely with library and scale is good.

RL – big murals on the new building – will you come back to us? A – yes, we identified four locations that could accommodate art. May not be at all locations and Pizzutis will be involved. Places to engage the pedestrian. Heavy focus on the landscaping and walk-up units. JM – like the murals but they should be rich and expressive not artificial or cheap. Should be permanent in nature. Wonders about safety in plaza due to the lack of differentiation of material. A – bollards are used. RL – windows as opposed to graphic at the north elevation might be better. SW – we can review graphics when we are reviewing signage.

SW – clarification on window treatment. New building does not have quality appearance. Massing and scale is fine. Need to work on the elevations. A – Use of uniform windows, but differentiation in materials. Clarification of placement of brick and other materials. SW – I don't have a problem with the pallet, but the elevations could be better. A – elevations, in and of themselves, are flat, and don't fully convey actual experience. Refer to the 3 dimensional images.

RL – massing, color and material changes work, I think keeping the old buildings and having the new buildings is a win for the city. I don't think this is a good submittal of a good product – it is more conceptual in nature than final. It doesn't tell us enough. A – schedule is fairly tight, in design development. SW – I'd like to see some tweaks on the elevations. Do we approved and ask for more detail or do we table? No changes to the building footprint or massing are being suggested. JM – come back to the next meeting, bringing details of the façade.

David Bishoff (DB) – I've been in practice of buying old, historic buildings. Requires a different skill set to maintain and manage. Grant – Oaks Apartments are historic I and deserve to be saved. They offer what community is struggling to have – work force housing. New apartments are unaffordable. Build your new apartments elsewhere, not here. The Grant – Oak can be renovated. Painting and putting cedar around doors doesn't work. Tearing down 50 units to build 80 isn't the way to go. Pushing out the people who are already there. I could offer a new contract to save. I'll pay the library and commit to keep it up. Need to maintain the existing fabric and there is room for old and new. Becky West – Columbus Landmarks – we had submitted a letter of support saving four of the Grant – Oak buildings. I have received a call from DB. In May 2018 all 7 buildings of Grant – Oaks were listed on the most endangered list. We do believe that all of these buildings are worthy of review.

ML – move to table until next month to receive additional details. No second. OB – this is the first time in my knowledge that someone has come forward with a proposal to do a project in a different way. I don't know how we should proceed. Too bad that RL left – could have addressed historic nature of these buildings. Concerned, a bit of a quandary, about proposal process and its timing. OB – seconds motion. There is already a contract on the building. ML – I don't think Mr. Bishoff's idea is a bad idea, but I think we are obligated to review what is in front

of us. Our code says in reference to demolition that if the project is a higher and better use, we have to consider. Mike Shannon – would like opportunity to come back next month. We are in contract with the library. I don't think it is right to second guess this project at this stage.

Results: Motion to table until next month to receive additional details. (4-0)

Case #3 18-12-3

1:46:30

Address: 92 N. Fifth St.

Design Professional: Marano Design Group

Applicant and Property Owner: Gay Street Condominium LLC

Request:

Certificate of Appropriateness for renovation into single family residence, including new detached two car garage.

Discussion: The brick will be painted with this project –much of the brick on the sides has weathered. The construction team for One Neighborhood has used the house as a field office for about 8 years. The roof was recently redone. SW – noticed that the rafter ends on the garage doesn't seem to go with the house, which seems to be simpler. A. The lifts in the garage could double the capacity of the garage from two cars to four. ML – move for approval, OB – 2nd.

Results: Motion to approve (4-0)

Case #4 18-12-4

1:50:24

Location: Franklin University Courtyard between 301 and 321 Rich Street

Applicant: Franklin University c/o Carl Brown

Property Owner: Franklin University

Design Professionals: EMI

Request:

Certificate of Appropriateness for renovation of university courtyard

Discussion: SW – this is a big improvement, particularly taking out the diagonal walks. CB – a lot of damaged concrete including sidewalks to nowhere. One goal is to create purposeful pathways. Another is to reduce concrete areas for more useful greenspace and to have a cohesive planting palette. Finally crime prevention through environmental design. Create an improved drop off area. Move flag poles to a more prominent position. EMI – issues with cyclist and skateboarders. The six trees around the catch basin are Princeton Elms. JM – likes the new plan , wondering if there is an opportunity to do something a little unusual with concrete treatment to the longest walk (spine). Accents or borders – scoring pattern, color. CB – extra width to allow for benches. EMI – brushed concrete with smooth edges SW – I don't like colored or stamped concrete but some exposed aggregate might be appropriate. CB – we have some exposed aggregate elsewhere on campus. OB – motion to approve, JM – 2nd.

Results: Motion to approve (4-0) Non-binding recommendation to edge the main sidewalk with an alternative treatment.

V. Ad Murals

Case #5 18-12-5M

1:59:26

Address: 60 E. Spring Street

Applicant: Orange Barrel Media

Property Owner: JSD Spring LLC

Request:

Approval of dimensional change to previously approved ad mural.

Change in Dimensions from **two** at 35'-9"W x 19'-6"H to **one** at 74'-9"W x 19'-6"H (left)
and two at 30'W x 73'H to **one** at 63'W x 73'H (right)

Remains two dimensional, lit, vinyl mesh banners.

Increase in Area of mural from 5,774 sf to 6,152 sf

Discussion: Staff - new legislation for ad murals requires that dimensional changes be brought to the Downtown Commission for approval. Staff had approved the current ad mural because of time constraints with the understanding that future murals be brought to the Commission. PS – design area is more flexible. OB has always struggled with finding four discreet panels. It always lacked cohesiveness. SW – I don't think we should increase the size. SM – I've always felt that the results with the four panels was good. The two new larger spots don't seem to relate very well. PS – owner (Dan Schmidt) originally felt that there would be flexibility in having four different clients. The Commission originally wanted all four panels to relate as one cohesive message. We are okay with shrinking the size so that the total area remains the same. You want the entire surface to read in one cohesive way. The divisions between the panels makes it hard to work with. Our intension is to have the same client for both panels.

The current Nationwide mural illustrates why having four panels would be difficult and harder. Could not have one child. SW – we go from four of a smaller scale to two that are pretty large in scale. Just too large. ML – can you do it one way or the other? PS – yes, that is our intension. We like the flexibility. ML – I don't mind the combination (2:08:04). I don't see the necessity to make it smaller and move the clips. OB – ***I would like to make a motion to accept with the changes that it go back to the original size.*** JM – the four panels is unique and the four looked like a cohesive design. PS – we'll still have that flexibility to do that. SW – still think that it is too massive, even if moved together. ML – 2nd OB's motion. Motion 2—2 (Wittmann, Maniace – no) Having four panels would have meant radically changing the design and emphasis of the Children's Hospital mural.

Results: Motion to approve. Vote 2 – 2 (Wittmann, Maniace – no) Motion fails

Case #6 18-12-6M

2:16:36

Zip Zone Tours ad mural

Address: 88 W. Mound Street

Applicant: Outfront Media – Dan Micelli

Property Owner: Kemp, Schaeffer & Rowe, Co., L.P.A. – Michael Schaffer

Request:

Design review and approval for installation of a vinyl mesh advertising mural to be located on the east elevation of 88 W. Mound Street. Proposed mural — Zip Zone Tours – “Zip Into Adventure”.

An ad mural (shown below) was installed in April 2018. CC3359.07(D).

Dimensions of mural: 16'W x 20'H, two dimensional, non lit

Area of mural: 320 sf

Approximate % of area that is text and or logo: 8%

Discussion: Staff - history of past actions. Originally the James Cancer Hospital had a mural here. Subsequent murals have been turned down. The City Attorney advised against a deed restriction and advised, at least on a temporary basis, provisional Commission review.

SW – what are you asking for? Would this application be establishing a location in terms of permanency? DJT – Commission had acted on establishing limits to its size (placement). JM – we struggled with this because this is a handsome building and because of the cluttering adjacent gas station. This is not the best location for a mural. MS – the mural would be mounted to a solid brick wall. When we bought the building in 1984 we had it evaluated in terms of its historic value and were told that, basically, it was not historic.

ML – we're reviewing this as if it were a new location? SW – to approve this would make it a permanent location. DM – if it means we have to come to the Commission each time, then so be it. JM – I don't think it was ever approved as a location. I thought we allowed the current one to go up so that we could discuss the legalities.

ML – my problem with the new code is that we don't have any control over the aesthetic. I understand why we don't have control over the content, but why no control over the aesthetic? Under the old rules, I wouldn't have a problem with this location, but can coming back, is that binding? MS – we see this as an ideal spot for a mural – it's got visibility. Outfront Media will come back for approvals, if necessary. We're asking for specific approval of the Zip Tour mural on a temporary basis.

OB – did we give this some special consideration because it was the James? ML – we can't do that. SW – our assumption was that you could work something out with the City Attorney. MS – we thought that the City Attorney would go along with this. SW - this time it is pretty clear that if the current application is approved that we have approved another location. ML – bring this in as a.) the location and 2.) the graphic. Can we make a provision on this location that they come back? SW – the answer to that is probably no. They don't have to come back – they might agree that they will do it. ML – it is still precedence. I don't know if coming back is legally binding.

MS – why is his not an ideal location? SW – right down the street from the county courthouse. JM – does this add or detract? MS – we think this is neutral. OB – motion to approve in regards to location, size and scale. ML – 2nd.

DM – is there a way to look to see if the location was originally approved?

Results: Motion to approve. Vote 2 – 2 (Wittmann, Maniace – no) Motion fails

VI. Business / Discussion

2:36:16

Columbus Metropolitan Club – December 12, 2018

Public Forum

Staff Certificates of Appropriateness have been issued since last notification November 15, 2018

Ad Mural – ***Bold & Italics***

1. A18-11-6 213 E. Rich - Garage door to Storefront
2. A18-11-7 236 E. Town – Banners
3. ***A18-11-8M - 35 W Spring- Apple-Lamar***
4. ***A18-11-9M - 15 W Cherry – Apple***
5. ***A18-11-10M - 56 E Long St - Apple***
6. ***A18-11-11M -263 N Front St - Apple***
7. ***A18-11-12M - 43 W Long St - Apple***
8. A18-11-13sc 1 E Gay - DonRey Cigar- Sidewalk
9. A18-12-1 215 E. Rich - Mobil Graphics
10. A18-12-2 107-111 S. High - Candid Sign
11. ***A18-12-3M - 64 E Broad - WGU – OB***
12. ***A18-12-4M - 106 N High - WGU - OB***

Next regular meeting will be on January 22, 2018, the third Tuesday of the month (five weeks away).

If you have questions concerning this agenda, please contact Daniel Thomas, Urban Design Manager, Planning Division at 614-645-8404. 2:44:28